



THE STATE BAR
OF CALIFORNIA

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF TRIAL COUNSEL
INTAKE

Dane Dauphine, Assistant Chief Trial Counsel

845 SOUTH FIGUEROA STREET, LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90017-2515

TELEPHONE: (213) 765-1000

FAX: (213) 765-1168

<http://www.calbar.ca.gov>

June 19, 2015

Vivian Moreno

Riverside, CA 92506

RE: Inquiry Number: 15-17534
Respondent: Gregory P. Priamos

Dear Ms. Moreno:

The State Bar's Office of the Chief Trial Counsel has reviewed your complaint against Gregory P. Priamos to determine whether there are sufficient grounds to prosecute a possible violation of the State Bar Act and/or Rules of Professional Conduct.

You have stated that Mr. Priamos is the County Counsel for the County of Riverside. A Riverside County Grand Jury was investigating the Riverside County Information Technology audit report from 2013. This County Board of Supervisors allegedly authorized the release of this report per a board resolution. The grand jury requested the report from the county, but Mr. Priamos demanded a written request before his office would release the report. You alleged that this violated Penal Code sections 921 and 925, which permits a grand jury access to public records.

In another Riverside Grand Jury matter in 2013, when Mr. Priamos was the Riverside City Attorney, a grand jury report found that Mr. Priamos did not adhere to grand jury secrecy provisions after he filed motions challenging subpoenas issued by the grand jury to members of the City of Riverside's police commission. He also made public statements indicating the subject of the grand jury's inquiry was a recent police shooting. While the grand jury's report admonished Mr. Priamos about this matter, your complaint did not include any facts to indicate a court made a finding of misconduct against Mr. Priamos.

You have alleged that Mr. Priamos' conduct violates Rules of Professional Conduct, rules 3-110, 3-210 and 5-200.

Based on our evaluation of the information provided, we are closing your complaint. Under the laws of California, the allegations against Gregory P. Priamos, if proved, would not be grounds for disciplinary action. As to rule 3-110, you are not Mr. Priamos client and therefore we cannot investigate a complaint on the grounds that he failed to competently perform legal services. Investigating this issue would interfere with the attorney-client confidentiality between Mr. Priamos and his current and former clients.

There are also no facts to show that Mr. Priamos advised a violation law, contrary to rule 3-210. While Penal Code section 921 permits a grand jury access to public records to investigate public agencies under section 925, but the grand jury still need to make a proper request for this information, such as

Vivian Moreno
June 19, 2015
Page 2

issuing a subpoena. It was not improper for Mr. Priamos to demand a written request for the Riverside County Information Technology audit report, even if the Board of Supervisors approved its release.

As to the issue when Mr. Priamos acted as the Riverside City Attorney and allegedly violated a secrecy admonishment, there are no facts to show that the grand jury informed him about an investigation of a police shooting. It appears that he surmised this based on the timing of the grand jury subpoenaing members of the city police commission.

Finally, there are no facts in your complaint to show that Mr. Priamos made a misrepresentation to a court in violation of rule 5-200.

~~For these reasons, the State Bar is closing this matter.~~


If you have new facts and circumstances that you believe may change our determination to close your complaint, you may submit a written statement with the new information to the Intake Unit for review. If you have any questions about this process, you may call Deputy Trial Counsel Alex Hackert at (213) 765-1498. If you leave a voice message, be sure to clearly identify the lawyer complained of, the inquiry number assigned, and your telephone number including the area code. We should return your call within two business days.

If you are not aware of new facts or circumstances but otherwise disagree with the decision to close your complaint, you may submit a request for review by the State Bar's Audit & Review Unit, which will review your complaint and the Intake Unit's decision to close the complaint. The Audit & Review Unit may reopen your complaint if it determines that your complaint was inappropriately closed or that you presented new, significant evidence to support your complaint. To request review by the Audit & Review Unit, you must submit your request **in writing**, together with any new evidence you wish to be considered, post-marked within **90 days of the date of this letter**, to:

State Bar of California,
Audit & Review Unit,
845 South Figueroa Street
Los Angeles, CA 90017-2515.

Thank you for bringing your concerns to the attention of the State Bar.

Best regards,



Alex Hackert
Deputy Trial Counsel

AH